1			
2			
3			
4			
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA		
6			
7			
8	WILD FISH CONSERVANCY, et al.,		
9	Plaintiffs,	CASE NO. C12-5109 BHS	
10	v.	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR	
11	NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, et al.,	RECONSIDERATION	
12	Defendants.		
13			
14	This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs Federation of Fly Fishers		
15	Steelhead Committee, Wild Fish Conservancy, Wild Salmon Rivers, and Wild Steelhead		
16	Coalition's ("Plaintiffs") motion for reconsideration (Dkt. 215).		
17	On March 26, 2014, the Court granted in part Plaintiffs' motion for summary		
18	judgment concluding that the Environmental Assessment ("EA") issued by NMFS on		
19	December 12, 2012 was inadequate. Dkt. 191. On May 19, 2014, Plaintiffs filed the		
20	instant motion requesting that the Court vacate two agency actions including the		
		inadequate EA. Dkt. 200. On July 31, 2014, the Court granted the motion as to the EA,	
21	inadequate EA. Dkt. 200. On July 31, 2014, t	he Court granted the motion as to the EA,	

but denied the motion as to an Incidental Take Statement ("ITS"). Dkt. 211. On August 7, 2014, Plaintiffs filed a motion for reconsideration. Dkt. 215. 2 3 Motions for reconsideration are governed by Local Rule CR 7(h), which provides 4 as follows: 5 Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not 6 have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence. 7 Local Rule CR 7(h)(1). 8 In this case, Plaintiffs argue that the Court should reconsider its decision not to 9 vacate the ITS. Dkt. 215. The Court initially rejected Plaintiffs' argument because it 10 concluded that it didn't have legal or equitable authority to set aside an action that was 11 otherwise in accordance with law. Plaintiffs clearly failed to address this issue of the 12 ITS's dependence on the EA during the liability phase of this proceeding. Requesting 13 such a dispositive ruling now is untimely, inappropriate, and prejudicial to Defendants. 14 Therefore, the Court **DENIES** the motion for reconsideration. 15 IT IS SO ORDERED. 16 Dated this 12th day of August, 2014. 17 18 19 United States District Judge 20 21

22